

**Region 2  
Regional Services Council Meeting  
Rensselaer, Indiana  
January 4, 2006**

The Regional Services Council met Wednesday, January 4, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. CST, at the Rensselaer Public Library, 208 W. Susan Street, Rensselaer, Indiana. The meeting was called to order by Charlotte Richey, Regional Manager (Region 2).

**Members in Attendance:**

Regional Manager Charlotte Richey  
Director Terrance Ciboch, Laporte County  
Director Ron Fisher, Newton County  
Director Larry Harris, Starke County  
Director Sharon Mathew, Jasper County  
Director Laurel Myers, Pulaski County  
Director Jon Rutkowski, Porter County  
Judge Michael Shurn, Pulaski County  
Judge Jeryl Leach, Newton County  
Magistrate Edward Nemeth, Porter County (serving as Judge Harper's proxy)  
CASA Director YSB Claudia Clark, Porter County  
FCM Eileen Walters, LaPorte County

**Old Business:**

Minutes from last meeting were discussed for content. Judge Leach requested his primary concern from last month be more clearly stated:

*"We need to be careful in our contracts that we write with these service providers that allow us the opportunity to contract with other entities if these services aren't being provided or are not being provided to the level we feel are necessary or proper in our county."*

Minutes were entered as official minutes from last months meeting.

**Funding Allocations for Region 2**

Char passed out a summary sheet she compiled to help illustrate how the various funding streams fit together. The chart shows the five main funding sources associated with the current RFP, the services codes (those numbers that are listed A-Y in the RFP), and breaks down which of the five funding streams the service codes fall into. Total regional funding amounts are listed. Larry Harris asked for clarification on whether this is the same 30 month allotment that the contracts propose. Char confirmed that it is.

Judge Leach asked for clarification on the funding. If the funding numbers are broken out per our region, he questioned if each county has an individual allotment and the contracts that we enter into for the actual services in our individual county will be coming out of our individual budgets and not a grouped regional budget. Char responded saying that there are a lot of regional proposals that were submitted and if we run out of money in one area we transfer around between counties.

Some of the proposals have dollar amounts that far exceed the allocations that are given to us. Larry Harris commented that one or two of the proposals would swallow up all the money, if we funded them. Char stated that some of the proposals are for a specific number of referrals and that there is no way that we have that many referrals to make. The providers might have submitted a proposal for 300 referrals but in reality we only use 50 a year. This may help with the costs once we go through them. Larry Harris said that as long as it is a zero based contract, we are not guaranteeing how much money we are going to give them; we are just guaranteeing the rate. He also stated that there are a couple of proposals that they do not want a service rate but they want "X" amount of dollars to fund their operation per month and we do have to talk about a budget for them.

**Proposals:**

Char passed out a summary of providers and proposal types she compiled from proposals that she received at the regional office. At the time of the meeting, twenty nine providers had submitted a total of 115 proposals for Region 2. Jim Shively, Child Welfare Services Coordinator, still has to go through all of these proposals and make sure that all the elements on the check list are completed. There is a possibility that some of these 115 proposals will not be on the final list because of errors or missing information.

Region 2 received eight non-standardized proposals from two providers. Both providers were from LaPorte County. There was much discussion regarding payment and obligation for non-standardized proposals. Char will try to get more guidance on non-standardized proposals. There were eight submitted and three of them are regional, the rest are for LaPorte County only. More discussion ensued regarding allocating money. Terry Ciboch commented that in so much as these are zero based dollars we still have to in some fashion allocate money, even if the money is not contractually allocated we need to in our accounting allocate it, so we don't all make 100 referrals and spend the money 90 times over. Larry Harris added that there has to be some control over the matter to ensure equitable access to the contracted services. Char asked the Directors if she is correct in saying that once we expend the money that is allocated and counties continue to make referrals then payment for those referrals will come out of your local budget. Larry Harris verified that she was correct. Terry Ciboch questioned if that language is actually going to be in the State contract.

Judge Shurn asked if there is a pot we can use before we get to our county budget. The general reply by several members was IV-B money. Larry Harris explained that the IV-B

Fund has always helped postpone dipping into our county monies. Terry Ciboch questioned if there is going to be a county allocation of this money or is it going to be first come, first serviced on a regional basis. The general reply by several members was that each county will still have allocations.

Laurel Myers commented that page 19, section K of the Regional Plan for Child Welfare Services, says that non-standardized will come out of IV-B Part I, Child Welfare Fund and Family and Children Fund. Char responded that there is no IV-B Part I anymore so she thinks it will have to come out of Part II. Laurel stated that Part II is for administration and planning not to exceed 10% so then it goes back to the Child Welfare Fund which probably most Directors have already obligated. Char added that the Child Welfare fund is only for 2006 and then it is expected to provide funding to sustain the Community Partners for Child Safety program. Char will get clarification because it will make a difference when selections are made in February.

Judge Leach voiced concern saying if we get one of those regional pots going and because there is no money or little money the council will be hit up to pay that on-going fee for something that we may never use. There was discussion regarding what the legislator will do regarding local property tax. Terry Ciboch added that if you have an on-going obligation, it would have to be fully funded before you could have that contract. The dollars would have to be identified, set aside, before you could have that contract. Char commented that it would not be a zero based contract. Terry Ciboch clarified that the Judge's concern was that if we have a non-zero based contract and obligated a certain amount of money what happens if we use up the federal money or whatever other source, would we automatically be in the county money. Terry stated that it would be a decision that would have to be made at the time we decide to agree to approve the contract. We would have to determine how much of these pots can go in there and how much local money if any has to go in there over the 30 months. In doing so, he feels that this would hook the State for that share of the Child Welfare Fund that the council obligated to go for this specific service because it is a State contract. If it ends up being State money then that money has to follow the State contract even if somebody else disperses it. Char commented that they are hoping to fund Community Partners for Child Safety with the Child Welfare Services money. Terry said this could be a problem for them if we obligate the money by State contract.

### **Service Standard Chart**

This chart was devised as a summary to show the types of proposals we received. Highlighted areas indicate that at least one proposal was received for that county for that specific service standard. Some had several, some only one. Jim Shively will create a spread sheet for each Director showing each proposal that passed for their area and what they will need to score. All but one county was hoping for a provider to do custody and step-parent adoption home studies but we did not receive any proposals for those. By the March meeting Char said we should be finished going through the entire process and the

Council can look at what we didn't get but what we wanted from this RFP and go ahead and do another RFP for those counties in Region 2 that want to contract for adoption home studies.

Magistrate Nemeth commented that Family House, the biggest provider for Porter County with regard to visitation facilitation, did not provide a proposal. His concern is that we know it is a problem now; is there anyway to fix it. Char answered saying she did not think so. Like the adoption home studies, she feels that we will have to go through the process and if we end up with a gap we will have to fill it. We may have to do an RFP stating that Porter County needs additional visitation facilitation but there is no guarantee that Family House will still be a provider for our wards. Terry Ciboch added that they won't have a chance to get any of this money; it will all have to be county money. They lost the opportunity to get this because this money is insufficient to cover the proposal in hand. Char stated that she knows that if we try to contract separate, Central Office will ask why Family House did not submit a proposal. The whole purpose of this process and this group is to funnel these services and then not make side agreements unless there is a legitimate service gap. There was some discussion regarding contracts and that contracts can be rejected because they do not fit the need or because they scored low. We have to take a look at who applied timely and work with them first before reopening the RFP. Magistrate Nemeth asked if all contracts regardless of the funding source still have to have the RFP's. Char confirmed that eventually this is the goal. Terry Ciboch further explained that if a provider is accepted and part of catchments they bid on was Porter County and they are able to provide visitation and you don't use them, there is no ability to pay them from our funds. If you don't use them you can't pay anybody else from our funds. There was much discussion regarding these contracts, whether they are exclusive contracts, what is the criteria for the state ending a contract if the provider does not meet the needs of the county, can we obligate Child Welfare Services money for 30 months (the length of the contract), if not how can we contract for 30 months if the money is not available.

### **Scoring Proposals**

Char stated that the scoring of all proposals will be done by DCS staff. It will be presented to the local Regional Director and then it will be presented at the February 1, 2006 meeting. The final list of accepted proposals will be available to Char and the local Directors on Friday, January 20, 2006. By Friday, January 27, 2006 the Directors must have summaries to Char of their scoring. Each county should score their own county specific proposals and when scoring each county should have a review team of at least three people. Each proposal should then have three score sheets. Regional proposals will be done by all six offices. Char prefers the Directors do the scoring but if there is absolutely no way for the Director to do it he/she will need to send someone else, such as their child welfare supervisor.

Shively is sending to each Director a summary of the providers they are to score. While reviewing these proposals if he finds any technical problems, he will notify the provider and give them five days to correct. Shively will send any corrected budgets to the Director. The proposals are up for review by all RSC members but only DCS will be scoring them. Contact your local county Director or Char to review these proposals. Terry Ciboch requested that someone from the regional coordinators office be in attendance at the meeting on February 1. If there are modifications that need to be made, the regional coordinators office is in charge of getting the providers to submit them.

By January 27 we will have summaries of the proposals and each proposal will have their score sheets. Each score is 0-100. The State has not given a cut off as to a pass/fail determination. Char will ask in Indy tomorrow if they want to give any further parameters as to selection based on scores.

Judge Shurn raised the idea of the County Directors contacting the Judges regarding the proposals received and getting their input prior to doing the scoring. Char requested that the six Directors notify the Judges when they receive their summaries from Shively on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January.

### **Comments and Discussion:**

Laurel Myers asked for clarification because in last months minutes it was specifically asked that if these services were not covered but we would like to have them how do we go about it and MB Lippold said once the goal and service standards are developed we can get somebody local. Laurel further stated she thinks all counties have some services that they provide now that do not necessarily fall into the service standard. These services are currently being paid out of Family and Children Fund.

There was much discussion between members with regard to contracts, if we are contracting local funds or just federal funds or both, our obligations to those contracts if other providers can be obtained cheaper than the contract, are we able to use new providers to the area that did not submit an RFP because they were not in existence during the bidding process, and if these funds are to be used for CHINS only or if it can be used for delinquents. Judge Leach asked if he could get a copy of a contract boilerplate. Magistrate Nemeth asked for clarification regarding Judge Harper's question and Deputy Director Lippold's response on page 3 of last months minutes. Terry Ciboch asked what happens if the council fails to decide at the next meeting to agree on a contract and then if she, the Regional Manager, becomes solely responsible for deciding all the services in the region. Char will ask Stephanie Beasley for input regarding such a scenario. Char will hand write out all the questions posed and take them to Deputy Director Lippold tomorrow.

Judge Shurn requested that Judge Harper e-mail all six Judges and let them know that during the last week of January their local county Director will call them to arrange a time to go over the proposals and scoring sheets. Magistrate Nemeth agreed to take the request back to Judge Harper.

**Timeline:**

January 20, 2006:	Final list of accepted proposals available to Regional Managers and Directors.
January 27, 2006:	Directors must submit summaries and scoring sheets to Regional Manager
February 1, 2006:	Council meeting, members will vote on the providers chosen
February 3, 2006:	Scored proposals are to be sent to Child Welfare Coordinator (They have eight weeks to enter information into Contract Management System)
March 31, 2006:	Contract is developed and sent to grantee

The next meeting will be held on February 1, 2006 at the Pulaski County Courthouse  
112 E Main Street Winamac, IN 46996

Meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Tammy Baker  
Account Clerk  
Jasper County DCS